



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,833	03/22/2004	Michael B. Martin	Heavyweight-1	1502
7590 Browning Bushman, P.C. Suite 1800 5718 Westheimer Houston, TX 77057		07/31/2007	EXAMINER NGUYEN, TUAN N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER 3751
			MAIL DATE 07/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/805,833	MARTIN, MICHAEL B.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan N. Nguyen	3751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 8-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as indicated below within the prior art rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 17-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: "above plurality of bristles" on line 19 of claim 17 should be --above the plurality of bristles--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claim 8, it is unclear as to the difference between "a plurality of bristles" in line 5 and "a plurality of bristles" in line 8. Regarding claim 17, it is unclear as to the difference between "a plurality of bristles" in line 7 and "a plurality of bristles" in line 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hepple in view of Besel et al. (hereinafter Besel).

Hepple discloses a scrub brush, which is considered as a weighted scrub brush due to the weight of the motor (76) acting thereon. The brush comprising a brush head (62) as claimed; a plurality of bristles (92) as claimed, the plurality of bristles (92) facing the floor as shown in Fig. 5) extending downward from the downwardly facing bristle support surface (defines by 90 or 91), the plurality of bristles does somewhat supporting the brush head when the brush is in use since it contact the floor; a weight (76), which is obviously removably positioned within a weight recess as claimed (see Fig. 1) because any part that assembled can be disassembled; a handle as claimed; a liquid intake port as claimed; a conduit as claimed; a liquid valve as claimed; a trigger as claimed; a liquid distribution manifold as claimed; and a chemical dispenser as claimed (see Fig. 1). The brush would inherently include a chemical valve as claimed; a male support member as claimed (which below the motor 76); and a cantilevered support latch as claimed.

Although the liquid supply of Hepple reference is not on the handle as claimed, attention is directed to the Besel reference, which discloses an analogous device, which further includes a liquid supply on the handle. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ, on the Hepple handle, a liquid supply as, for example, taught by Besel in order to conveniently move the device around without having to drag the hose around.

7. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besel.

Besel discloses a scrub brush, which is considered as a weighted scrub brush due to the weight of the motor (18) acting thereon. The Besel includes the structure of the weighted brush as claimed, a plurality of bristles (30L facing the floor as shown in Fig. 2) extending downward from the downwardly facing bristle support surface (defines by 30P), the plurality of bristles does somewhat supporting the brush head when the brush is in use since it contact the floor; wherein the weight is motor (18) which is inherently removable and the roller is wheel (34) where a user may be pivoted to a forward, inverted position to roll the brush if the user desires to. Furthermore, the roller (wheels 34) is secured to a central body via rod (34A), the roller rotatably mounted to the brush head and having a central axis (about 34A) spaced above the plurality of bristles such that the brush head may be pivoted to a forward, inverted position (the position when a user press on the handle 14H of Besel, the brush head tilting upward with respect to he back wheels will obviously cause the bristles to disengaged from the floor) to roll the scrub brush on the roller while the bristles are disengaged from a floor surface. The pair of laterally opposing outer body portions (about 14F) does taper downwardly from the top toward the laterally opposing ends (14F). The end of member 18 would obviously have a male end that sit in the female support of the head. The cantilevered support latch as claimed is a well known fastening means in the fastener art to clamp one member to another.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1-7 are free of the prior art of record.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan N. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (10:00-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (571) 272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tuan Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3751

TN